DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 150 124 SP 012 154

AUTHOR	Tom, Alan R.
TITLE	Field Based Teacher Education: Implementation Issues.
PUB DATE	Oct 76
NOTE	27p.; Paper presented to the National Teacher Education Conference (Indianapolis, Indiana, October 1976)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Decision Making; Educational Philosophy; *Educational Problems; *Field Experience Programs; Interpersonal Problems; *Preservice Education; *Program Development; Student Teacher Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Field Based Teacher Education; *Implementation Problems; Logistical Problems

ABSTRACT

The process of field-based teacher education (FBTE) over a five-year period at the Washington University (St. Louis) is reviewed, with emphasis on two areas: (1) shifting philosophical bases upon which the program was constructed and (2) recurring implementation problems impeding full program development. Three philosophies are identified as providing primary direction at different periods: first, an inquiry-personal commitment model of teacher education with the student-teacher as originator of much of the program direction and content. The second direction viewed decision making as a shared process, and the third saw a predefined "good teacher" as the result of program participation, thus feeling little need for a process of shared decision making. The changing philosophical view is summarized as representing differences across cycles in the expectations held for students and attitudes toward the planning of curricular activities. Six implementation problems prominent in at least two of the three philosophical cycles are identified: university staff disagreement, interpersonal crises, surprise events, the dominance of logistics, typical student teacher problems, and the dilemma of teacher involvement. The occurrence and reoccurrence of each of these problems over the five-year period are described and analyzed. Implications for future FBTE programs are examined, beginning with an analysis of the limitations of the concept, and an analysis of one factor--decision making--identified as common to four of the six problem areas. Recommendations for coping with these problems include: (1) development of ground rules for decision making; (2) formation of a small group of core FBTE faculty; (3) control of decision making complexity; (4) development of slack space built into staff meeting schedules; and (5) preparation for decision and conflict. (MJB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED150124

Field Based Teacher Education: Implementation Issues

Alan R. Tom

Washington University
St. Louis, Missouri

Paper presented to the
National Teacher Education Conference
Indianapolis, Indiana
October 1976

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

SP012 154

Discovering the question in field based teacher education (FBTE) is harder than answering it. What is the meaning of this statement? I have a strong interest in FBTE and considerable data related to five years of FBTE at Washington University. Yet I had trouble deciding how to approach the analysis of these data. Recounting my struggle to formulate the question will, I hope, give the reader insight into the complexities of FBTE.

Identifying the Issue

The major impulse for this paper is my belief that the implementation of a FBTE Program is far more complicated than is generally recognized. Not being a pessimist, I believe that these complexities can be coped with, particularly if the faculty of a FBTE program is willing to examine the problems as well as the possibilities of FBTE. With our five years of experience in FBTE at Washington University, we should be able to help other colleges or universities interested in FBTE anticipate some of the problems which are likely to accompany this approach. With this conviction in mind I wrote a note last March to the current FBTE faculty that I wanted to make a presentation to the National Conference on Teacher Education. I suggested that this presentation could be expanded into a joint effort if any of the four of them wanted to participate. I concluded the note by saying: "My own interest is in doing a presentation which stresses some of the problems/dilemmas which a field based teacher education approach faces. The analysis would be done from the perspective of school/university interaction and the perspective of creating a new setting (a la Sarason). I am interested in looking at the entire five years of our experience with field based teacher education." One faculty member briefly considered the possibility of a joint effort with me, two did not respond, and the fourth wrote: "I am concerned about how the program is represented to this group. And whether your or anyone else's account is taken as definitive or 'official.'"

As a result I was not only on my own but in addition I needed to be careful that the analysis of the current program was well documented. Indeed, tension between me and the current FBTE staff over analysis of their program went back to the prior summer at which time my proposal for program evaluation was rejected by the staff. In spite of the history of tension over program evaluation, I decided to submit the program proposal I had outlined in my note to the FBTE faculty. All too often, I reasoned, interesting clinical efforts are not reported in the literature because interpersonal conflicts or political problems make such reporting difficult. At the same time I resolved to omit names;[1] to rely whenever possible on public and other written records rather than on retrospective interviews, personal recollection, or other less public sources of data; to take seriously my promise to analyze the first four years as well as the most recent one. I hoped that depersonalizing the analysis, stressing public sources of data, and making the analysis as historical as possible would yield a paper which spoke to specific issues without being overly evaluative of any particular faculty member, school person, student teacher, or school situation.

Even before the program proposal was accepted I started filing away ideas which occurred to me at odd moments. One page which found its way into my file listed the patterns which I thought characterized our five years of experience with FBTE. Examples of these patterns include: high rate of university faculty turnover, concern within other parts of our department over the amount of resources given to FBTE, the high level of intellectual and interpersonal conflict within the FBTE faculty, the tendency of unexpected events to alter prearranged plans. So many of these patterns were negative that I dreamed up a fancy concept, "multiple points for failure," to capture the idea that a FBTE program could be in difficulty if a single key link in the "chain" of a FBTE Program were to weaken. This difficulty, moreover, could be substantial even if almost all of the other

critical points were operating well. Would it not be valuable, I thought, to clearly identify the links whose failure was fatal to a FBTE program?

At the same time that I was musing over the concept of "failure points" I tried to think about FBTE by posing questions which genuinely puzzled me. Three questions found their way into the file: (1) Why have I found myself so often being a critic of our field based efforts even though I am sympathetic to the concept of field based teacher education? (2) Why have there been several abrupt changes in philosophical orientation during the five years of FBTE? (3) Why have our field based programs had such differential impact on students, with some students emerging from a program in joyful praise of it but others leaving in frustration, even bitterness. In my file notes I jotted down a few hunches, but I did not make much progress in systematically addressing these three questions.

In mid-May I was notified that my program proposal had been accepted. Now my thoughts turned back to the original proposal in which I had promised to examine the "problems/dilemmas that can be expected to accompany the implementation of field based teacher education." Which way should I go: problems/dilemmas, failure points, or questions which puzzle me? Unable to decide, I buried myself for several weeks in all the data I had. I read notes from staff meetings, position papers, student evaluations, personal field notes, unpublished papers. As I read I looked for ideas which appeared more than once; these ideas were then grouped on one note card. Gradually I saw that my data tended to be organized around problems, perhaps because the individuals involved over the five years talked and wrote extensively about issues which were causing them trouble. While the categories of data might also be related to failure points, it seemed overly ambitious to identify the links whose failure was fatal to a FBTE program. Similarly, the data I had did not throw much light on the three questions, except that I did have extensive data which illustrated that there were indeed philosophical turning points in the five year history of FBTE at Washington University.

In the end my choice among the alternatives was determined largely by what the data I had might illuminate best. I selected a "problems" approach as my guiding theme, though I decided not to limit my analysis to school/university interaction and the creation of a new setting since the data in my possession suggested that there were important implementation issues which did not fall in either of these categories. In addition I decided to document the changing philosophical orientations because finding implementation problems which cut across various philosophical approaches to FBTE raises our confidence that these are problems endemic to FBTE rather than ones peculiar to a particular approach to FBTE.

Philosophical Orientations: Three Cycles

In the short space of five years there have been three distinct orientations to FBTE at Washington University. The first "cycle" was one year in length and was identified as an inquiry-personal commitment model of teacher education. The co-directors of the first cycle did not continue the second year, and the second year faculty conceptualized an approach whose central idea was the cooperative development of teacher education by school and university personnel. This approach continued for three years until a key faculty member left the university. The third cycle began in the fall of 1975; it was based on a particular conception of the good teacher. Each of these three cycles combined instruction in various curriculum areas with student teaching type activities.

In 1971-72 nineteen students and five Washington University faculty members spent one year in a nearby elementary school. Influenced by the thinking of John Dewey and Robert Schaefer, the faculty tried to implement an inquiry-personal commitment model of teacher education. One major goal of the model was that students should "think their way into teaching" so that they could develop their own "personal theories of teaching." This inquiry was to occur by moving the students through a series of cycles: "from experience to conceptualization, from conceptualization to practice and from

practice to an evaluation that produces the data necessary for the step back to experience" and the start of a new cycle. The intent was to develop teachers "whose behavior in the educational enterprise is not dependent on the prescriptions of authority figures."[2]

Complementing the inquiry aspect of this model was an emphasis on personal commitment or "origin-based behavior." Based on origin-pawn theory, this aspect of the model stressed the need of student teachers to develop their own realistic goals and to determine concrete activities that they can do to achieve these goals. In this manner, student teachers, rather than viewing themselves as pawns subject to external forces, would become origins capable of originating intentionsand behavior. All through the year an attempt was made to have student teachers formulate personal goals and develop plans for realizing these goals.[3] Students were not to be required to master the teaching skills which compose the core of so many teacher education programs. The inclusion of such competency features was viewed as consistent with the "inquiry-personal commitment" model only if they were clearly subordinated to the humanistic orientation of the model.[4] In other words, the students, as origins, needed to participate in any decision which led to the inclusion of basic teaching skills in their program of teacher preparation.

However, as the staff planned for the next year's program it increased the emphasis on required teaching skills and concurrently played down the role of novice teachers as origins. At a meeting on May 18, 1972, the staff decided that the fall instructional program would have "more structure. Rather than waiting for externs [student teachers] to express needs, we will attempt to predict some of them. We will build a skeletal structure allowing for flexibility when needed." The staff agreed to start the year with an Observational Training Seminar and to begin Reading and Math minicourses on September 18.[5] In a subsequent description of the 1972-73 program, teaching skills were identified as one of the three fundamental bases of the program. The program committed itself to the view that "a prospective teacher must acquire a battery of technical skills in order to develop

into a professional teacher." Yet the final goal was not technicians, but rather selfactualizing, humane teachers.[6]

The rising status of teaching skills was not the only major difference between the 1971-72 program and that of 1972-73. In addition the origin-pawn concept was superseded by the concept of shared decision making: "The program is committed firmly to the principle that all parties involved (University faculty, teachers, students) have a right and even a responsibility to participate in decisions which will affect them.... In practice, this [collegial] relationship means that students are given opportunities to raise questions and to develop strategies to answer them both on their own as students and in cooperation with the University and school professionals. It also means that University faculty, teachers and prospective teachers concerned with developing effective learning experiences for children have an opportunity to identify objectives and goals together, and to develop programs to implement those goals as a team."[7] While shared decision making is similar to the origin-pawn concept in that both suggest that people have a right to participate in decisions which affect them, shared decision making--at least as it was defined in this case--recognized that the university faculty had the final responsibility over the curriculum for the prospective teachers.[8] As a result student teachers might in certain cases become pawns subject to the dictates of the university faculty.

The emphasis on shared decision making and teaching skills persisted for three years. All through this time period the documents which outlined the basic purposes of the program go through only modest changes in wording. The staff had a strong belief that course work had to be closely related to experience in the classroom, that technical skills were important, and that a successful program required a cooperative effort of students, school personnel, and university faculty. The essential assumption of those three years is captured in the staff's

definition of program: "A program is more than a set of arrangements and a collection of people--it's people working together and solving concerns and problems together."[9]

This assumption- that the essence of a program was the cooperative effort to create it--was rejected by the faculty of the 1975-76 effort. This group believed that teacher education programs, including cooperatively developed ones, are typically eclectic and that this absence of a unified or consistent theoretical position had a number of undesirable consequences. Among the consequences of eclectic programs are: confusion among the students, no clear rationale for selecting the content of professional education, little integration among courses or between courses and teaching practice, a tendency to overemphasize the practical problems felt by students to the detriment of social and political issues relevant to schooling. Instead of eclecticism and its attendant problems, what is needed is a program based on a conception of the good teacher.[10]

The staff agreed that the central commitment of the good teacher should be to "arranging a school environment which encourages [the] intellectual, emotional and social growth of children." In order to achieve this broad goal a teacher needs to attain the following four objectives: to accept moral responsibility for the lives of school children; to become conscious of alternative possibilities for acting in the school setting; to reflect critically on these alternatives; and to possess the practical skills needed to carry out his/her considered choices. The key to this program, therefore, is the link between thought and action. Not only must there be awareness of alternatives and the exercise of critical intelligence, but in addition a teacher must be able to carry out his/her ideas in practice.[11]

Since the 1975-76 university faculty was primarily interested in an end, the good teacher, it saw little need for the process of shared decision making. Most

of its efforts were to be directed toward devising the curriculum experiences which would best stimulate the novice to attain its definition of the good teacher. Another difference between 1975-76 and the preceding cycle was the former's desire to place teaching skills within the context of the model of the good teacher. If this integration of skill and conceptual framework of the good teacher fails to occur, then skill training may do nothing more than encourage the novice to adapt to the status quo; alternative courses of action can be better explored if skill training is placed in a broader framework.[12]

One way to summarize the differences among the three cycles is to compare across cycles the expectations held for a student and the attitude toward the planning of curriculum activities. The inquiry-personal commitment model expected the student to develop his own personal theory of teaching, and this model did not stress preplanning of curriculum actitivities since detailed preplanning would be inconsistent with treating the students as origins. In contrast the third cycle presented the incoming student with a model of good teaching within which he/she was to work; extensive preplanning occurred to assure that the student was systematically exposed to the elements of good teaching. The shared decision making model, because it both stressed process and recognized the ultimate responsibility of the university faculty, expected the student both to master certain basic teaching skills and to participate in decisions which might revise or alter this professional curriculum. As a result the planning ideal was a prearranged structure which allowed for flexibility.

Problems of Implementation

Examination of the data--unpublished studies, personal field notes, minutes of staff meetings, student and teacher program evaluations, position papers, memoes, and recall of events--led to the formulation of six implementation problems which were prominent in at least two of the three cycles. These problems are: university staff disagreement, interpersonal crises, surprise events, the dominance of logistics, typical student teacher problems, the dilemma of teacher involvement. This section

of the paper attempts to document each of these six patterns while the last section examines some of the implications of these implementation problems for the practitioner of FBTE.

University staff disagreement. Frequent disagreements occurred among the university staff that conducted each of the five years of FBTE. At times such differences of opinion focused primarily on the philosophy underlying a program. In the first year, for example, the five participating faculty members had varying degrees of commitment to the inquiry-personal commitment model; two adhered closely to the model, one believed in the model but also wanted careful programming for skill development, and two were more inclined to stress "how to do it" approaches to teaching than inquiry or personal commitment.[13] While the faculty members realized they held differing conceptions of the program and wanted to discuss the relative merits of an inquiry as opposed to a more performance oriented approach, not enough of this type of dialogue occurred to resolve their philosophical discrepancies.[14] An outside observer concluded that by the spring of the year the university staff had "agreed to disagree."[15]

In contrast to this disagreement over philosophy, the staff in the following year had its internal debates primarily over procedural issues, e.g., the timing of several observational days between the first and second student teaching placement, who should be included when programmatic decisions were to be made, was grading for student teaching to be done solely by the university staff or by the staff and the cooperating teachers, what role should be played by the university staff when a conflict occurred between a student teacher and a cooperating teacher.[16]

The year 1975-76 also witnessed considerable conflict among the university staff. These differences were frequently over procedural issues but sometimes over philosophical issues. Examples include: whether decision making procedures and role responsibilities should be discussed before or after the guiding instructional themes were developed, how much the program was to be for the benefit of the doctoral students (who were acting as supervisors) as opposed to being for

the undergraduates; whether the awareness goals were better approached situationally (using situations faced by the student teachers) or through more general, often abstract, analysis and discussion; should letter grades or pass/fail marking be used for student teaching evaluation; should the program be started with a heavy dose of survival skills or with an emphasis on awareness exercises; should we select schools and work with the teachers we find in these schools or should we select good teacher models regardless of where they are located.[17]

Interpersonal Crises. Field based efforts, just as more traditional ones, have crises "caused" by an individual student teacher. Frequently, a beginning student teacher violates a school norm--not wearing a bra or not saying the pledge of allegiance--and gets into trouble with a teacher and/or principal. Since one or more university faculty members are on site, such "crises" are quickly resolved.[18] Similarly, the hurt feelings of a cooperating teacher who has been omitted from the invitation list to an orientation meeting can be readily assuaged by an alert faculty member.[19] Solving these crises involving individuals is usually easy in a FBTE program since the university staff develops a close working relationship with teachers and administrators.

However, crises which involve a number of people can, and often do, develop into large scale events which are difficult to resolve. One such crisis occurred in the first cycle. At the end of a rather disappointing workshop session one Wednesday in November a student criticized the workshop sessions because a different subject was introduced each time and because there was too little time for follow through in the classroom. In the words of an eye witness: "Suddenly the frustrations started pouring out from all quarters. It was as if the key log in a log-jam had been sprung loose." Some students were concerned about how grades were to be given. Others were worried about discipline problems and their role in communicating with parents. Some wanted increased structure so they could be more

certain of what was expected of them, while others felt certain faculty members were already overly specific in their demands. Some students felt university faculty were not on site often enough; others were unclear about how supervisory responsibilities were split between cooperating teachers and university faculty. The university faculty responded to these and other criticisms by setting up committees to deal with several of the more pressing problems, including arrangements for an end-of-term evaluation of the program. Considerable effort was required to deal with the issues which spilled out that November afternoon.[20]

Examples of other interpersonal crises involving a number of people are the following: several teachers strongly disagreed with a student teaching grade given to a particular student; students attempted to alter the semester schedule to gain more vacation time or to end the program early (this happened several times); a cooperating teacher made public a letter calling for more initiative by student teachers and for clarification of the cooperating teacher responsibilities; students criticized the quality and quantity of supervision done by one staff member.[21] These "group" crises are often exacerbated by the university faculty's difficulty in agreeing on how to respond to them. Moreover, even after a particular crisis is resolved, there often remain hurt feelings and concerns which influence the subsequent behavior of the participants.

Surprise events. Typically the so-called "group interpersonal crises" well-up, boil awhile just below the surface, and finally explode onto center stage. In contrast to this gradual eruption in which warning cues are usually evident, the "surprise event" gives no particular warning of its impending occurrence. Usually the surprise event involves only one person (or possibly two), yet it often has widespread effect.

A classic case of the surprise event is the severe illness of one of the university faculty members. This illness occurred at the beginning of the school

year and had a major impact on the offering of coursework, the revision of the program rationale, the scheduling of vacation times, and the solution of other minor and major issues. Other examples of surprise events from various years are: the failure of a key faculty member to receive a tenure appointment; the mid-year decision by two students to leave the program, resulting in staff disagreement over the granting of credit and grades for the fall semester; the presence of a student who alienated teachers by her open and sharp criticism of them. In addition to these surprise events which had major repercussions, a myriad of lesser unforeseen events are scattered across the five year history of FBTE at Washington University.[22]

The dominance of logistics. If one divides a FBTE program into issues of direction, i.e., the rationale and goals for a program, and issues of logistics, i.e., the means for reachings these endpoints, one is amazed by the staff time devoted to logistical concerns and by the breadth of these concerns.

A good way to grasp the breadth of logistical issues is to review the staff minutes for 1972-73, the only year in which there are written minutes for every staff meeting. The following tabulation lists topics handled in 1972-73 by the staff in its twenty or so meetings; the number of times a particular topic was discussed is included in parentheses:

Increasing teacher involvement in the program (3)

Subcontracting the math course to an outside organization (7)

Revising credential file letter and program description (5)

Making student teacher placements (3)

Setting vacation time for students (5)

Scheduling of course work for students (8)

The possibility of a camping trip (1)

The student teacher role in parent conferences (2)

Obtaining teacher reaction to the program (3)

Rearranging supervisory assignments (1)

Continuing the program in 1973-74 (1)

Discussing supervisory arrangements for pre school placements (1)

Making a master schedule of supervisory conferences (1)

The Superintendent's visit to the program (2)

Procedures for making programmatic decisions (1)

Setting up a session on job interviews (3)

Teacher released time to work with student teachers (1)

Grading policy (1)

Placement of students not connected with the FBTE program (2)

Scheduling conflicts caused by campus responsibilities (3)

Establishing minimal expectations for student teachers (2)

Justifying a course to the department chairman (1)

In addition to these logistical topics which were important enough to appear on an agenda, there were additional topics which were not of enough significance to warrant staff meeting time. These logistical issues were discussed informally among the staff.

The content of logistical issues tends to alter in response to new programmatic goals. For instance, the third cycle, with its concern for a specific approach to good teaching, spent enormous amounts of staff time on the logistics of providing appropriate curriculum experiences for the student teachers. A second factor which affects the content of logistical issues is changes in the staff's thinking on the best structure for the FBTE program. This past year, for example, there was extensive discussion concerning which three to five schools the program should be associated with, while in 1972-73, when the program was in only one school, this issue appeared on a staff meeting agenda only once. Since the programmatic

goals have evolved through three cycles and the staff's thinking about structural arrangements has changed over time, there always seems to be a new set of logistical issues to replace those that are "solved."

One of the most significant structural changes occurred in the fall of 1975. At that time the FBTE program stopped being a one year program which was an alternative to the campus-based elementary program and instead became a one semester program to be taken by all elementary certification students. This alteration occurred simultaneously with the beginning of what I have termed the third cycle and with a major change in supervisory arrangements. The logistical "fall out" was enormous, resulting in extra staff meetings, a significant revision of supervisory arrangements in late September, and extensive attention all year to the logistics of curriculum planning. Contrary to the conventional wisdom that logistical issues taper off after the initial year, our experience has been that logistical concerns persist, though their content may change over time.

Typical student teacher problems. Student evaluations lead one to believe that student teachers in a FBTE program have the same types of problems that are experienced by student teachers in campus based programs. Students have personality and philosophic conflicts with their cooperating teachers, they believe they are not observed enough by university faculty, they want more opportunity to talk with their cooperating teacher, and so forth.

The conflicts with cooperating teachers may have occurred somewhat less frequently than is the case in a campus based program, but they did happen regularly over the five years. That these conflicts arose is not surprising in that our FBTE programs utilized the traditional cooperating teacher-student teacher relationship. This relationship often produces tension and conflict.

23

The student perception that the university staff often did not do enough supervision is less easy to understand since the staff was field based and, therefore, spent considerable time in classrooms and in discussion with students.

However, a number of other demands--including logistical issues, staff disagreements, interpersonal crises, surprise events, responsibilities outside of FBTE--tended to pull the university staff away from classrooms. In addition there is evidence, at least for 1975-76, that the university staff spent a disproportionate amount of time with student teachers who were having trouble and/or were perceived by the staff as being "weak." To counteract this tendency one member of the staff actually went around in late spring to visit several of the students who had received less attention than the others. One student recognized this propensity toward unequal attention as he mildly criticized the supervision he had received: "I felt overlooked in the watching of my performance by the supervisors. I realize there were other student-teachers who were having serious problems and attention needed to them. Yet I guess its the old question of giving help to the 'underachiever' or helping the others." This same student, however, also commented that "if I ever did need help, I felt free to contact my supervisors."

The availability and openness of the staff often seemed to override criticisms students had of the program. One student concluded her evaluation with the statement: "The most beautiful element in this program is the honest, sincere, warm and concerned feeling that everyone has for each other. I always felt sure that I could come and talk to any number of people for many different reasons. The close-knit family-type feeling which prevailed made me feel secure in a new and often difficult situation."[25] While not every student over the five years left the program in such a euphoric state, many did leave believing that the FBTE experience, particularly the staff, was one of the highlights of their college career.

The dilemma of teacher involvement. With the exception of 1975-76, the university faculty responsible for FBTE had a strong commitment to involving the cooperating teachers in the activities of the program. Even in 1975-76, there was a sizeable portion of the university staff interested in teacher involvement.[26] Yet all through the five years teachers regularly complained that they did not know what the goals and activities of the programs were and/or what specific expectations the univer-

sity faculty had for them in their role as cooperating teachers.

In the first cycle, for example, teachers had misgivings about two points: "Communication between the teachers and the [university] staff was inadequate, and there was no clear understanding about how [university] training activities related to the training responsibilities of the teachers." Out of considerable discussion came the development of the triad, a team of a university faculty member, a student teacher, and a cooperating teacher. The triad arrangement included guidelines which were to facilitate the setting of goals for each student teacher, the dividing of supervisory responsibilities between cooperating teacher and university faculty member, and the establishing of regular meeting times for the triad.[27]

Even though the guidelines apparently helped regularize communication among the three parties, the triad arrangement did not seem to lead to cooperating teacher understanding of the theoretical ideas which underlay the first cycle. Of a sample of five teachers interviewed in the spring, only one "had heard of or remembered hearing of the inquiry based approach to teaching or the idea of thinking one's way into teaching." None remembered having seen any document which outlined the rationale of the program. All of them stressed the need for more information and communication, basically the same request which had led to the formation of triads several months earlier.[28]

The next fall, the beginning of the second cycle, a public letter from a cooperating teacher precipitated another attempt by the university faculty to clarify the program. Staff meeting minutes for November 10, 1972, noted: "In partial response to the very constructive feedback letter from [teacher X], the university staff felt the strong need for a concise statement of the principles and objectives with which we are operating in [Year] II." Such a statement was prepared and distributed to teachers at a joint school-university meeting on

November 30. Yet at the end of the year, a joint school-university planning committee was again discussing how teachers could be made more aware of the activities of the program. The joint planning committee resolved that course syllabi should be given to teachers next year and that a written statement should be developed of role expectations for student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervisors.[29]

By an odd quirk of fate the same cooperating teacher who had addressed a letter to the staff in the fall of 1972 had a student teacher in the spring of 1976. As can be seen from the following quote from her student teacher's final evaluation form, "teacher X" still did not believe she knew what was going on: "There should definitely be more information about the student teaching for the cooperating teacher. My teacher expressed disappointment that she couldn't be as useful as possible. She suggested a listing of material/approaches or expectations that the program outlined for the students be distributed to cooperating teachers..." Teacher lack of awareness of the program seemed to be a long term trend.[30]

Another form of teacher involvement besides teacher awareness of program activities and goals is teacher participation in the planning and implementation of the program for the prospective teachers. The second cycle university faculty made such participation by teachers -- i.e., shared decision making -- a central theme of its efforts. While several teachers participated extensively during the second cycle, particularly in the first year of that cycle, teacher participation seemed to be an elusive target. Finding a way for them to attend Friday morning staff meetings was difficult because of their teaching responsibilities; special late afternoon and evening meetings were occassionally scheduled so that teachers might attend.[31] Yet there seemed to be no incentives to participation other than committment to professional training, and there was considerable feeling that teachers lacked the time for major involvement in the program.[32]

Teacher participation, even more than teacher awareness, remains a Holy Grail.

Implications

One obvious implication of finding three cycles of philosophical orientations is a loss of confidence in the term field based teacher education. Typically the term is defined as follows: "Field based teacher education is based on-site in a school or group of schools which may be called teacher education centers".[33] While all three cycles were on-site, differences among them in programmatic emphasis were considerable. To cluster them together under the umbrella of FBTE is to mask these differences and to suggest commonalities which simply do not exist.

The term need not be abandoned, but its limitations must be acknowledged. While FBTE specifies where a program occurs, it does not reveal the purposes that are being pursued. Nor does it indicate the structure to be used, e.g., whether teachers and students are to have a signficant role in programmatic decisions. A teacher education program that is on-site and therefore field based must also have its basic purposes and structural arrangements clearly designated. Not until this delineation occurs is a program adequately defined.

What beyond a clear statement of purposes and structure is necessary, particularly as a FBTE faculty focuses on program implementation? How does a FBTE faculty minimize the six problem areas identified in this paper? Before addressing the implementation issue directly, I believe that further analysis of the six areas is desirable because four of the six areas have a common characteristic: decision making.

The making of decisions is central to university staff disagreement and to logistical issues, and a FBTE staff must decide how to respond to surprise events and interpersonal crises. Again and again a FBTE faculty is faced with decisions, some limited in scope such as logistics and others that outline the fundamental

purposes to be pursued. Not all of these decisions can be made prior to the beginning of a program. Among the decisions which cannot be preplanned are some logistical ones and those related to surprise events and interpersonal crises. Moreover, in the case of decisions made during the program, there is the added dimension of timing. Does the staff, for example, anticipate a potential interpersonal crisis, wait in the hope that it will "blow over," or divert attention from it by some diversionary tactic? Deciding when to act may be as complicated and time consuming as deciding how to act.

Besides the variety, sequencing, and timing of decisions, a fourth dimension involves the composition of the decision making body. Are all decisions "team" decisions or are some decisions reserved to certain individuals? Are teachers and students to be included in some decisions? If so, which ones are to be shared with them? It is rather easy to construct a decision making body that results in a very complex decision making process, and rather difficult to have an extensive amount of teaming without significant decision making complications.

Keeping the dynamics of decision making in mind, I make the following recommendations to help a FBTE faculty cope with the six implementation issues discussed in this paper:

Ground rules for decision making. Determining who is in the decision making body and which decisions are under the jurisdiction of this body is itself a major decision. The best time to address this decision on decision making ground rules is before conflict over philosophical and procedural issues arises. Resolving concrete disputes at the same time as guidelines for resolving disputes are being established is a perilous approach, a point well made by Seymour Sarason.[34] Yet the creation of ground rules is hard work and tends to be avoided because its value is not apparent until conflicts arise.

Small core group. One way to reduce decision making strain is to keep the core group of university faculty as small as possible. Instead of a large number of people, each of whom has extensive responsibilities outside a FBTE program, the ideal should be intensive involvement of a small number of faculty members. For each reduction of one faculty member, there is one less person to concur with the ground rules, to participate in staff meetings, to approve of a specific course of action. Instead of being better, a bigger core group may actually be worse, particularly if there is a commitment to involve teachers and students in certain decisions. Under such conditions the achievement of consensus can become an exercise in futility.

Control of complexity. While some factors--e.g., surprise events--which complicate the decision making process cannot be averted, others can to some extent be controlled. For instance, a small core group intensively involved in a FBTE program should be able to perceive the cues of an impending interpersonal crisis and to agree quickly on corrective action. Similarly, a small core group can make one consideration of substantive decisions be the logistical implications of these decisions. If a particular course of action entails too many logistical complications, then it can be rejected or can be delayed until a later time. Seeing the future implications of current decisions and being on top of the current situation are concrete ways of reducing the complexity of a FBTE program.

Slack space. In spite of attempts to control complexity, to develop a small core group, and to provide ground rules, there are likely to be more problems than anticipated. To make sure that these problems receive adequate discussion, a FBTE faculty should build slack time into the staff meeting schedule. Otherwise the development of unanticipated problems can throw a well planned and well functioning effort into disarray.

Be prepared for decisions and conflict. In the end there will remain numerous decisions, and these decisions will require attention to detail and to grand

design. Frequently, the decisions will lead to conflict. The FBTE faculty needs to be prepared for decisions and conflict so that it will not feel that this result is a sign of failure. Hopefully participants in these efforts will study the implementation process to illuminate its dynamics and to formulate something beyond the rules of thumb outlined in this paper.[35]

The rules of thumb I have developed do not relate very directly to two of the implementation problems: typical student teacher problems and the dilemma of teacher involvement. Neither of these problems is particularly easy to resolve, but they are both important impediments to the long term success of FBTE. It is hard to conceive of a truly successful FBTE program in which the clinical site, the classroom, is under the jurisdiction of a teacher unconnected to the rest of the clinical staff, the university faculty. This distinction of school and university in the traditional campus based program is one of the prime motives for moving to a FBTE approach. Interestingly, the most perplexing typical student teacher problem also involves the cooperating teacher; philosophic and personality conflicts between teacher and student teacher are difficult to avoid and harder to resolve.

To be honest I do not know how the gap between school and university can be eliminated as long as schools are unwilling to provide teachers with time and professional advancement incentives to participate in teacher preparation activities. This type of support is unlikely; local schools have many priorities more pressing than preservice teacher preparation. For a brief time several years ago our FBTE faculty was on the verge of developing a close working relationship with a small group of teachers. In retrospect that short term relationship was possible because of several strong friendships and the willingness on both sides to contribute extra time and effort to the building of a collegial atmosphere.

Significant teacher involvement in preservice teacher education may have to await the development of new organizational arrangments which encourage this participation. Perhaps we will have to reinvent the campus laboratory school or develop clinical schools which are structurally connected to institutions of higher education. Or perhaps someone will formulate a workable arrangement which can bridge the gap between existing public schools and university. Not until we know how to involve the practitioner in charge of the clinical site will we be able to test the potential of FBTE.

Footnotes

[1]The only case in which names are not coded is when an individual is the author of a public document which is referred to in the text or a footnote of this paper.

[2]"Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Undergraduate Education" (St. Louis, Mo.: Graduate Institute of Education, Washington University, 1970); Arthur G. Wirth, An Inquiry-Personal Commitment Model of Teacher Education (St. Louis, Mo.: Graduate Institute of Education, Washington University, n.d.), I, 8-14.

[3]Wirth, An Inquiry-Personal Commitment Model, I, 14-17; Richard deCharms "Personal Causation Training in the Schools", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 2 (April - June, 1972), 95-97.

[4]Arthur G. Wirth, note to the author, September 13, 1972.

[5]Minutes for staff meeting of May 18, 1972.

[6]Program description, February 15, 1973.

[7]Program description, February 15, 1973.

[8]Tim Tomlinson, "My Personal Version of H-TEP", November 14, 1972. In the same document the author noted that when "a decision was clearly in the domain of the school, the University staff recognized that domain." Shared decision making, therefore, did have limits.

[9]Letter to incoming students, July 17, 1974.

[10]Harold Berlak, "Toward the Development of a Rationale and Structure of the STEP Clinical Semester", n.d.

[11]Evaluation questionnaire prepared by the staff for the spring of 1976. Earlier statements of the characteristics of the "good teacher" differ from the one in the evaluation questionnaire; I have chosen the

most recent statement because the staff held the position that its view of the "good teacher" would evolve over time.

[12]Harold Berlak, "Planning Ideas", n.d.; Berlak, "Rationale for the STEP Clinical Semester."

[13]Mary Ellen Finch, "Five Advisors in Search of a Model", May 16, 1972.

[14]Wirth, An Inquiry-Personal Commitment Model, II, 29-30, and III, 9-10.

[15]Finch, "Five Advisors", 19-20.

[16]Minutes for staff meetings of October 20, 1972, and November 3, 1972; Kathy Denst, "Problems of the 1972-73 H-TEP Project", n.d., 9-10.

[17]Alan Tom, field notes, September 5, 1975; Alan Tom, "Analysis of Professional Semester with a view toward next year (possibly next semester)," December 15, 1975; Alan Tom, "Why the Norm in Student Teaching Grading Should Be Pass," November 3, 1975; Berlak, "Rationale for the STEP Clinical Semester;" Alan Tom, "Working Paper--Professional Semester Planning", February 11, 1975.

[18]Alan Tom, field notes, September 3, 1975, and September 5, 1975.

[19]Alan Tom, field notes, August 27, 1975.

[20]Wirth, An Inquiry-Personal Commitment Model, II, 16-22.

[21]A teacher's open letter, November 7, 1972; student evaluation questionnaires for Fall 1975; Denst, "Problems of the 1972-73 H-TEP Project", 8.

[22]Minutes for staff meetings of September 8, 1972, and September 15, 1972; Finch, "Five Advisors", 20-22, 26; Denst, "Problems of the 1972-73 H-TEP Project", 10-11.

[23]Garth Sorenson, "What Is Learned in Practice Teaching?" Journal of Teacher Education, 18 (Summer, 1967), 173-78; James MacDonald, "Student Teaching: Benefit or Burden", Journal of Teacher Education, 22 (Spring,

1971), 51-58.

[24]A student evaluation questionnaire for Spring 1976.

[25]A student evaluation questionnaire for Fall 1975.

[26]Alan Tom, field notes, August 27, 1975, and August 2, 1976.

[27]Wirth, An Inquiry-Personal Commitment Model, II, 22-25.

[28]Finch, "Five Advisors", 16-17.

[29]Minutes of HTEP III Planning Group, April 4, 1973; Alan Tom, field notes, April 24, 1973.

[30]No conclusive generalization can be made about 1975-76 since this group did not formally try to assess teacher awareness of its program.

[31]Minutes for staff meetings of September 8, 1972; October 22, 1972; February 12, 1973; and March 5, 1973.

[32]Minutes for staff meeting of February 5, 1973; Alan Tom, discussion with principal, May 1973; teacher evaluations of the program, November 13, 1972.

[33]Marvin Pasch and Marvin Pozdol, "The Development of Field Based Teacher Education Programs at Cleveland State University," a position paper submitted to the College of Education at Cleveland State University, 1973. Available from ERIC:ED 093 860.

[34]Seymour Sarason, The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972), 71-85.

[35]At Washington University two dissertations are in process; one is on 1972-73 and the other is on 1975-76.